

### REMARKS

Claims 5-49 are pending. In this paper, claims 5, 10, 14, 29, 34, and 39 have been amended to include the distinguishing features indicated by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments raise no new issues requiring further searching or consideration. Entry is therefore respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 10-12, 25, 27, 34, 35, 37, 39, and 49 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) for being anticipated by the Tone patent. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite “a film type front surface filter formed directly on a front surface of the panel.” (Emphasis added). The Examiner indicated that an amendment of this type would be sufficient to distinguish claim 1 from the Tone patent,<sup>1</sup> i.e., as shown in Figure 1 of the Tone patent, a gap exists between front plate 1 and plasma panel 2; and as shown in Figs. 6-8, gasket 17 and/or a metal fixing jig extend into the gap.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable based on the foregoing differences, and that claims 11, 12, 25, and 27 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 10 and also based on the features separately recited therein. Withdrawal of the §102 rejection is respectfully requested.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the comments on page 15 of the Final Office Action

Claims 34 and 39 have been amended to recite features similar to claim 10. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that these claims and their dependent claims are allowable.

Claims 13, 26, and 36 were rejected under § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Tone-Yoshikawa combination. This rejection is traversed on grounds that the Yoshikawa patent fails to teach or suggest the features of base claims 10 and 34 missing from the Tone patent.

Claims 5-7, 9, 14-16, 18, 22-24, 28-31, 33, 38, and 40-48 under § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Tone-Koike combination. This rejection is traversed on grounds that the Koike patent fails to teach or suggest the features added by amended to claim 5 and base claims 14 and 29, i.e., Koike discloses that various layers are narrower or smaller in width than a display area. However, Koike does not teach or suggest a film type front surface filter “disposed directly on” a front surface of the panel to have a wider area than the panel. Absent a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 14, 29, and their dependent claims are allowable over a Tone-Koike combination.

Claims 8, 17, 19, 20, 21 and 32 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Tone-Koike-Yoshikawa combination. This rejection is traversed on grounds that the Koike and Yoshikawa patents fail to teach or suggest the features added by amendment to base claims 5, 14, and 29.

Serial No. 10/696,996  
Amdt. dated August 16, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of June 9, 2006

Docket No. HI-0184

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.  
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros, Esq.  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK/SWN:knh  
**Date: August 16, 2006**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**